

2012 Monitoring Summary



Bear Creek at "Oregonia Road" Crossing SE of Sterling in Tuscaloosa County (33.54245/-87.56167)

BACKGROUND

The Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM) monitors Bear Creek as a "best attainable condition" reference watershed, based on land use, road density, and population density for comparison with streams throughout the Southwestern Appalachian ecoregion. Data collected at these reaches are used as the basis of comparison for streams in same ecoregion and to develop water quality criteria.

Additionally, Bear Creek was selected for biological and water quality monitoring as part of the 2012 Assessment of the Black Warrior and Cahaba (BWC) River Basins. The objectives of the BWC Basin Assessments were to assess the biological integrity of each monitoring site and to estimate overall water quality within the BWC basin group.



Figure 1. Bear Creek at BERT-4, May 2, 2012.

WATERSHED CHARACTERISTICS

Watershed characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Bear Creek is a small Fish & Wildlife (F&W) stream located in the Shale Hills ecoregion (68f) near Sterling, Alabama. This creek drains fifteen square miles in Tuscaloosa County. Based on the 2006 National Land Cover Dataset, landuse within the watershed is primarily forest (75%) followed by shrub/scrub. Population density is relatively low. As of September 1, 2012, ADEM has issued four construction permits in this watershed.

REACH CHARACTERISTICS

General observations (Table 2) and a habitat assessment (Table 3) were completed during the macroinvertebrate assessment. In comparison with reference reaches in the same ecoregion, they give an indication of the physical condition of the site and the quality and availability of habitat.

Bear Creek at BERT-4 is a riffle-run stream with bedrock, cobble, boulder, gravel, and sand substrates (Figure 1). Overall habitat quality was categorized as optimal due to the habitat created by snags, leaf packs and root banks within the reach.

Table 1. Summary of watershed characteristics.

| Watershed | Watershed Characteristics | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Basin | | Black Warrior River | | |
| Drainage Area (mi ²) | | 15 | | |
| Ecoregion ^a | | 68f | | |
| % Landuse | | | | |
| Wetland | Woody | 2 | | |
| Forest | Deciduous | 28 | | |
| | Evergreen | 35 | | |
| | Mixed | 12 | | |
| Shrub/scrub | | 18 | | |
| Grassland/herbaceous | | 4 | | |
| Pasture/hay | | <1 | | |
| Cultivated crops | | | | |
| Development | Open space | 1 | | |
| Barren | | <1 | | |
| Population/km ^{2b} | | 1 | | |
| # NPDES Permits ^c | TOTAL | 4 | | |
| Construction Stormwater | | 3 | | |
| Municipal Individual | | 1 | | |

- a.Shale Hills
- b.2000 US Census
- c.#NPDES permits downloaded from ADEM's NPDES Management System database, September 1, 2012.

Table 2. Physical characteristics of Bear Creek at BERT-4, May 2, 2012.

| Physical Characteristics | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Canopy Cover | Estimate 50/50 | | |
| Width (ft) | 10 | | |
| Depth (ft) | | | |
| Riffle | 0.4 | | |
| Run | 1.0 | | |
| Pool | 1.5 | | |
| % of Reach | | | |
| Riffle | 10 | | |
| Run | 60 | | |
| Pool | 30 | | |
| % Substrate | | | |
| Bedrock | 35 | | |
| Boulder | 10 | | |
| Cobble | 20 | | |
| Gravel | 10 | | |
| Sand | 10 | | |
| Silt | 10 | | |
| Organic Matter | 5 | | |

Table 3. Results of the habitat assessment conducted on Bear Creek at BERT-4, May 2, 2012.

| Habitat Assessment | %Maximum | Score Rating |
|---------------------------------|----------|---------------------|
| Instream Habitat Quality | 78 | Optimal >70 |
| Sediment Deposition | 80 | Optimal >70 |
| Sinuosity | 85 | Optimal >84 |
| Bank and Vegetative Stability | y 59 | Marginal (35-59) |
| Riparian Buffer | 81 | Sub-optimal (70-89) |
| Habitat Assessment Score | 179 | |
| % Maximum Score | 75 | Optimal >70 |

BIOASSESSMENT RESULTS

Benthic macroinvertebrate communities were sampled using ADEM's Intensive Multi-habitat Bioassessment methodology (WMB-I). The WMB-I uses measures of taxonomic richness, community composition, and community tolerance to assess the overall health of the macroinvertebrate community. Each metric is scored on a 100 point scale. The final score is the average of all individual metric scores. Metric results indicated the macroinvertebrate community to be in *good* community condition (Table 4).

Table 4. Results of the macroinvertebrate bioassessment conducted in Bear Creek at BERT-4, May 2, 2012.

| Macroinvertebrate Assessment | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| Taxa richness measures | Results | Scores (0-100) | | | |
| # EPT taxa | 20 | 70 | | | |
| Taxonomic composition measures | | | | | |
| % Non-insect taxa | 11 | 58 | | | |
| % Dominant taxon | 26 | 60 | | | |
| % EPC taxa | 33 | 63 | | | |
| Functional feeding group measures | | | | | |
| % Predators | 11 | 42 | | | |
| Tolerance measures | | | | | |
| % Taxa as Tolerant | 24 | 73 | | | |
| WMB-I Assessment Score | | 61 | | | |
| WMB-I Assessment Rating | | Good (59-79) | | | |

WATER CHEMISTRY

Results of water chemistry analyses are presented in Table 5. In situ measurements and water samples were collected monthly, and semi-monthly (metals) from April through December of 2012 to help identify any stressors to the biological communities. Stream flows were generally lower than normal during 2012. Stream pH was below the F&W use classification criterion in April. Median concentration of specific conductivity and hardness were higher than the median concentration of all verified reference reach data collected in ecoregion 68. The median concentration of total iron was also higher than expected.

SUMMARY

As part of assessment process, ADEM will review the monitoring information presented in this report along with all other available data.

Bioassessment results indicated the macroinvertebrate community to be in *good* condition. Habitat quality and availability was assessed as *optimal* for supporting macroinvertebrate communities, despite lower than normal stream flows during 2012. However, median concentrations of specific conductivity and hardness were higher than expected in this ecoregion. Monitoring should continue to ensure that biological and water quality conditions remain stable.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT: Sreeletha Kumar, ADEM Environmental Indicators Section 1350 Coliseum Boulevard Montgomery, AL 36110 (334) 260-2782 skumar@adem.state.al.us

Table 5. Summary of water quality data collected April-December, 2012. Minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) values calculated using minimum detection limits (MDL). Median, average (Avg), and standard deviations (SD) values were calculated by multiplying the MDL by 0.5 when results were less than this value.

| MDL by 0.5 when results were less than this value. | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|-------|---------|-------------------|-------|-------|---|
| Parameter | N | | Min | Max | Med | Avg | SD | Ε |
| Physical | | | | | | | | |
| Temperature (°C) | 11 | | 9.5 | 28.7 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 5.8 | |
| Turbidity (NTU) | 11 | | 5.2 | 50.2 | 11.7 | 17.9 | 13.6 | |
| Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L) | 9 | | 20.0 | 80.0 | 66.0 | 56.7 | 22.4 | |
| Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) | 9 | < | 1.0 | 14.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 4.4 | |
| Specific Conductance (µmhos) | 11 | | 44.8 | 81.6 | 65.1 ^G | 63.9 | 12.6 | |
| Hardness (mg/L) | 5 | | 12.1 | 18.0 | 15.3 ^G | 15.0 | 2.4 | |
| Alkalinity (mg/L) | 9 | | 6.5 | 54.7 | 12.0 | 17.3 | 15.0 | |
| Stream Flow (cfs) | 9 | | 8.0 | 16.2 | 2.5 | 5.6 | 6.0 | |
| Chemical | | | | | | | | |
| Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L) | 11 | | 7.1 | 10.4 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 1.0 | |
| pH (su) | 11 | | 5.7 | 8.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 0.6 | 1 |
| Ammonia Nitrogen (mg/L) | 9 | < | 0.007 | 0.036 | 0.004 | 0.007 | 0.011 | |
| ^J Nitrate+Nitrite Nitrogen (mg/L) | 9 | < | 0.005 | 0.280 | 0.055 | 0.111 | 0.108 | |
| ^J Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L) | 9 | < | 0.041 | 0.303 | 0.051 | 0.103 | 0.102 | |
| JTotal Nitrogen (mg/L) | 9 | < | 0.023 | 0.385 | 0.238 | 0.214 | 0.130 | |
| JDissolved Reactive Phosphorus (mg/L) | 7 | < | 0.004 | 0.007 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.002 | |
| JTotal Phosphorus (mg/L) | 9 | | 0.008 | 0.031 | 0.012 | 0.016 | 0.008 | |
| JCBOD-5 (mg/L) | 7 | < | 2.0 | < 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | |
| Chlorides (mg/L) | 9 | | 3.2 | 12.8 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 4.0 | |
| Total Metals | | | | | | | | |
| J Aluminum (mg/L) | 5 | < | 0.043 | 1.370 | 0.165 | 0.533 | 0.619 | |
| Iron (mg/L) | 5 | | 0.308 | 1.860 | 1.120 M | 1.005 | 0.607 | |
| J Manganese (mg/L) | 5 | | 0.016 | 0.051 | 0.039 | 0.034 | 0.015 | |
| Dissolved Metals | | | | | | | | |
| J Aluminum (mg/L) | 3 | < | 0.043 | 0.046 | 0.022 | 0.030 | 0.014 | |
| Antimony (µg/L) | 3 | < | 3.6 | < 3.6 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 0.0 | |
| Arsenic (µg/L) | 5 | < | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.3 | |
| Cadmium (µg/L) | 5 | < | 0.000 | < 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |
| Chromium (mg/L) | 5 | < | 0.009 | 0.032 | 0.004 | 0.007 | 0.005 | |
| Copper (mg/L) | 5 | < | 0.020 | 0.031 | 0.010 | 0.011 | 0.002 | |
| J Iron (mg/L) | 3 | < | 0.019 | 0.699 | 0.085 | 0.264 | 0.378 | |
| Lead (µg/L) | 5 | < | 0.9 | < 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | |
| ^J Manganese (mg/L) | 3 | | 0.016 | 0.043 | 0.020 | 0.026 | 0.014 | |
| Mercury (µg/L) | 3 | < | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.018 | 0.018 | 0.000 | |
| Nickel (mg/L) | 5 | < | 0.016 | 0.042 | 0.021 | 0.018 | 0.006 | |
| Selenium (µg/L) | 3 | < | 2.5 | < 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 | |
| Silver (µg/L) | 5 | < | 0.000 | < 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |
| Thallium (µg/L) | 3 | < | 1.4 | < 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | |
| Zinc (mg/L) Biological | 5 | < | 0.012 | 0.017 | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.001 | |
| • | 7 | | 0.40 | F 24 | 0.53 | 1.10 | 1.00 | |
| Chlorophyll a (ug/L) J E. coli (col/100mL) | | < | 0.10 | 5.34 | 0.53 | 1.19 | 1.86 | |
| E. COII (COI/ TOUTIL) | 7 | | 36 | 291 | 135 | 154 | 104 | |

C=(F&W) criterion violated; G=value > median concentration of all verified reference reach data collected in the ecoregion 68; J=estimate; M=value > 90th percentile of all verified ecoregional reference reach data collected within ecoregions 68; N=# samples.